Case 1:99-cr-05039-REC Document 188 Filed 05/04/05 Page 1 of 2

SALOME MADRIGAL OSEGUERA,

VS.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Petitioner,

Respondent.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

No. CV-F-05-581 REC (No. CR-F-99-5039 REC)

ORDER DISMISSING MOTION TO VACATE, SET ASIDE OR CORRECT SENTENCE AND DIRECTING ENTRY OF JUDGMENT FOR RESPONDENT

On May 2, 2005, petitioner Salome Madrigal Oseguera filed a motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Petitioner contends that his defense counsel, stated to be Francine Zepeda at all stages, failed to file a notice of appeal after being requested to do so by petitioner.

On July 2, 2003, petitioner filed a Section 2255 motion asserting the identical claim against defense counsel Juan Falcon. By Order filed on September 4, 2003, the court

¹In his prior Section 2255 motion, petitioner claimed that defense counsel Dana Anderson failed to file a notice of appeal

Case 1:99-cr-05039-REC Document 188 Filed 05/04/05 Page 2 of 2

dismissed this petition as untimely. Judgment for respondent was entered. Petitioner did not appeal the dismissal.

Because the court did not reach the merits of petitioner's prior Section 2255 motion, the court does not dismiss the instant motion as a second or successive motion. See United States v. Mathews, 833 F.2d 161, 164 (9^{th} Cir. 1987).

However, the court again concludes that the instant motion is untimely for the reasons set forth in the Order filed on September 4, 2003 and dismisses the instant motion on that ground.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>May 4, 2005</u> 668554

/s/ Robert E. Coyle UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

13 14

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

various orders, petitioner was represented by Juan Falcon at the 25 time of sentencing. Therefore, petitioner's assertion in the instant motion that Francine Zepeda was ineffective because of the 26 failure to file a notice of appeal is factually incorrect.

after being requested to do so. However, as the court noted in